

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Brian Bober [boberb@rpi.edu]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 8:15 PM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** Opposition to digital copy protection flag

Dear Chairman,

While you are allowing conventional TV signals to take up a lot of the bandwidth, you are wasting time with cockamamny, half-baked copy-protection schemes that will never work. Just get HDTV out there already! Who cares if CBS won't broadcast -- that's their loss! We don't need them, we just need more bandwidth freed of the spectrum, and better reception. There are ample ways to circumvent these technologies for a sophisticated pirater, and all you are doing is hurting the clueless consumers. You are also probably going to put things like TiVo out of business, and make it so tech-heads will not be able to legally make their own open-source versions of technologies like TiVo.

I would like to voice my opposition to the digital copy protection flag on broadcasts. Besides the possibility of having to buy new equipment, I also think this goes against fair use policy just like other cockamamny copy protection schemes. It will not affect the big pirates because they will have systems to get around it (just like there are scrubbers for macrovision) and only people it will hurt are consumers.

For instance, if I'm at a class and want to watch a show, I'll tape it on the VCR so I can see the show when I get back. If I watch the commercials, then there isn't any difference with seeing the show live or seeing it a couple hours later.

The assumption that consumers will replace their current systems at the whim of the FCC and the media is ludicrous! Consumers have had enough with having to replace their equipment at the whim of greedy corporations. Next we will need new DVD players for watermarking. When will it end? Consumers are only going to want to buy new products if there is a significant improvement in technology, and not because you and media companies screwed up on copy protection and want to try it over.

Stop being so inept and do things right. For instance, you should have allowed pass-through for Macrovision on VCRs. Just because you want to block copying in VCRs doesn't mean people can't use their VCR as a modulator! TVs with built-in VCRs can't even watch Macrovision.

Realize you are doing nothing but hurting consumers. Any sophisticated pirate can just modify a DVD-ROM, VCR, and make is own equipment for copying. He or she could write new DVDs without Macrovision, and remove the copy-protection signals from the broadcasts! They will ALWAYS find a way around, and as you hurt consumers by more of these cockamamny schemes making anything but an all-in-one system usable, people are either going to not buy your technology, or find more clever ways to break copy-protection.

The results of this will be the following:

- I and others will not buy such equipment.
- I will not watch TV anymore if such equipment is necessary.

Do you guys even understand this technology, or are you just politicians? I'm beginning to believe the latter. I recommend you get people with technical knowledge on the FCC. Your abuses are sky-high, and listening to business lobbyists and not to consumers has gotten you into a world of trouble. For instance, you just gave clearchannel and viacom an even larger monopoly without even consulting taxpayers! You let Viacom walk all over you, and I think you should bring the president of Viacom up on purgery charges for saying all taxpayers know about this. I am very up on technology and even I didn't know. Start doing your job and having forums with the people that actually pay your salaries and stop giving into the ludicrous demands of big-business. Small businesses are the pillars of the nation and even if these big companies folded, we'd have small companies fill in the void.

---

Brian Bober - Electrical and Computer Systems Engineering/CompSci dual major, Business Minor

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Arthur Olney [Arthur@blomand.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 8:06 PM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Arthur Olney  
HC 77 Box 244  
Altamont, TN 37301  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Paul Vogt [aggie\_knight@bellsouth.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 7:29 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Paul Vogt  
315 Lago Cir Apt 303  
West Melbourne, FL 32904  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Daniel Yefimov [dan@integrate.ru]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 1:17 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Daniel Yefimov  
Vernadsky ave., bld. 89-5, flat 82  
Moscow, 117526  
Russia

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Joshua Bradbury [bradbujr@muohio.edu]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 12:24 PM  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Joshua Bradbury  
7330 Tepperwood Dr.  
West Chester, OH 45069  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** William Fry [jbry@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 9:11 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

William Fry  
244 Clearview Dr  
Vallejo, CA 94591  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Michael Deaver [madeaver11@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 8:37 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Michael Deaver  
11619 Melody Garden  
Cypress, TX 77429  
USA



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Debbie Utley [debbie\_utley@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 3:55 AM  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Debbie Utley  
5024 Rhonda Dr.  
San Jose, CA 95129  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Donald Newcombe Jr [zanxxx@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 12:19 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 31, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Donald Newcombe Jr  
54 Brook Street  
Hudson, MA 01749  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** David Hair [thehairs@tampabay.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 4:19 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 31, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

David Hair  
6916 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Sarasota, FL 34243  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of mike@duigou.org  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:55 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/25/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Michael Duigou  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> mike@duigou.org  
<ADDRESS1> 819 Peralta Ave.  
<CITY> Berkeley  
<STATE> CA  
<ZIP> 94707  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> As a computer professional with more than 20 years experience it is my strong belief that the broadcast flag proposed in FCC 02-231 does an extreme dis-service to the consumers. In particular it seems likely that the measures proposed would provide inconvenience significant a great number of people and restrict fair use in the name of preventing piracy.

History has shown that determined pirates with an economic incentive will eventually bypass any security measures, however strong. Protection measures built into DirectTV satellite, the Microsoft Xbox, Sony Microsoft, and the DVD industry all have succumbed over time. Economic pirates generally take advantage of their piracy by producing counterfeit goods that are then sold to unwitting, honest consumers.

None of the measures presented, in my professional opinion, offer anything other than annoyance to anyone. They will unnecessarily restrict fair use, they will not deter economically oriented pirates and most importantly they will not advance adoption of DTV receivers and equipment. Consumers will reject solutions which cause them to lose features. This in part was why the adoption of DVDs took so long (lack of record) and, for example, why the older ReplayTV products with automatic commercial skip (a feature new units lack) sell well in the used equipment market.

The content industry has a history of adopting "the sky is falling" with every new technology and they sound their own death knell at every turn. Don't accept their cry of "wolf". If the content consumer is treated fairly then they will treat the content producers fairly.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of john@indy.rr.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 06, 2003 3:21 AM  
**To:** outreach@nyfairuse.org  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 04/06/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> John Oesterling  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> john@indy.rr.com  
<ADDRESS1> 3101 South Keystone Avenue  
<CITY> Indianapolis  
<STATE> In  
<ZIP> 46237  
<PHONE> 317 932 4643

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> With the economy as poor as it currently is, no one is going to be able to afford to update to digital television. I fine my television to be quite satisfactory just the way that it is and I strongly object to any interference with the system as it currently is working fine. Only individuals in a very high income level can afford digital tv and I do not want restrictions placed on any broadcasts that are aired over the public airways. The attempt to add this flag would specifically deprive citizens of program material being broadcast on channels licensed for broadcast television and I feel that proprietary transmissions should be conducted only on frequencies outside of the public channels.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of mefunk@mail.med.cornell.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:57 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/23/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Mark Funk

<CONTACT-EMAIL> mefunk@mail.med.cornell.edu

<ADDRESS1> 345 E. 69th St. #5H

<CITY> New York

<STATE> NY

<ZIP> 10021

<PHONE> 212 746-6073

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> I am opposed to the "broadcast flag" restrictions that the FCC are considering. While piracy is certainly of concern, these restrictions will take away the simple pleasures of taping television shows and watching them at a time and place that are convenient. I remember quite well the hysteria that Hollywood studios had when VCRs first appeared. They should admit that despite their worst fears, they are making more money than ever from rented and purchased videos. Concerns for profits from Hollywood studios should not precedence over the rights of law-abiding citizens.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of ravsamuel@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:57 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/22/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Ravie Samuel  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> ravsamuel@yahoo.com  
<ADDRESS1> 10604 Satinwood  
<CITY> ORLANDO  
<STATE> FL  
<ZIP> 32825  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Dear Chairman/Commissioner,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Mr. Ravie Samuel.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of EricAltendorf@orst.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:56 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/25/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Eric Altendorf  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> EricAltendorf@orst.edu  
<ADDRESS1> 404 NW 11th  
<CITY> Corvallis  
<STATE> OR  
<ZIP> 97330  
<PHONE> 541-908-2394  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> I oppose the idea of the broadcast flag and write to ask you to oppose it as well. As has been stated over and over again, free citizens are not mere consumers; they are not a separate group from so-called "professionals.". The stakeholders in a truly just information policy in a free society are the public, not those who would reserve special rights to control public uses of information technology.



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of joe@joegratz.net  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:55 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/25/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Joseph Gratz  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> joe@joegratz.net  
<ADDRESS1> 1400 S 2nd St  
<CITY> Minneapolis  
<STATE> MN  
<ZIP> 53211  
<PHONE> 612-235-4049  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> I oppose the broadcast flag regulation. I am a computer hobbyist and video content designer. My work for theatre and other media occasionally involves the fair use of broadcast images for television, for purposes of criticism and parody. It is important for my art that these images be of the highest possible quality. While I look forward to the coming of digital television, I do not look forward to being unable to make legal use of broadcast signals because of unwise regulations.

Thank you.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jackknife@cox.net  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:55 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/25/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Luke A Johnson  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> jackknife@cox.net  
<ADDRESS1> 908 W Apollo Ave  
<CITY> Tempe  
<STATE> AZ  
<ZIP> 85283  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> I have no objection to a content provider adding a broadcast flag (or any other signal) to the images they assemble and mass market. Nor do I object to a manufacturer of electronics making use of such a flag to provide additional features to their customers. I do, however, strongly object to bringing a law into effect that requires all electronics manufacturers to comply with the wishes of the film industry (or any other content provider). The reason being that this clearly is only in the best interest of the established movie industry and not the public. It prevents innovation and development of new products because digital content electronics providers will have to have their use model sanctioned by a body whose primary purpose is to make money - not enable other entrepreneurs to make money nor to improve the quality of life of consumers (unless somehow they can charge for it). This power will be abused and it will be difficult for anyone to produce a new product! without the consent of the movie industry.

This law is being brought forward in an attempt to put the audio-video electronics industry into a strangle-hold that will force "business as usual" rather than allowing the industry to evolve with emerging technologies.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of schwartz@his.om  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:55 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/25/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Dana Schwartz

<CONTACT-EMAIL> schwartz@his. om

<ADDRESS1> 9325 Creekview Drive

<CITY> Laurel

<STATE> MD

<ZIP> 20708

<PHONE> 301-725-6281

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> I am opposed to the implementation of the "Broadcast Flag" for digital TV broadcasts. I am a law-abiding consumer and viewer that sees this as a threat to my ability to lawfully time-shift broadcast material to suit my own viewing needs, and as a blatant attempt by the content producers to further limit my rights and increase their already exorbitant profits. Please do not allow this "flag" to be implemented.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of tony@sonet.net  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:55 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/25/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Tony Williams  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> tony@sonet.net  
<ADDRESS1> 144 Redbird Drive  
<CITY> Hamilton  
<STATE> AL  
<ZIP> 35570  
<PHONE> 2059213837  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> I am opposed to the broadcast flag. Why change the current fair use for TV broadcasts. I thought the issue was decided when the VCR was introduced to the general public. Please continue to allow the public to record and store digital data with the ease and use as we currently record and store analog data.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of peters@earlham.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:54 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/25/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Peter Suber  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> peters@earlham.edu  
<ADDRESS1> 80 Judy Point Lane  
<CITY> Brooksville  
<STATE> ME  
<ZIP> 04617  
<PHONE> 207-326-9482  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> The FCC has to put the public interest ahead of the interest of one industry. Broadcast flag will be a big win for the TV industry and a big loss --of freedom, money, and untold technological innovations-- to the public. This is the kind of proposal we expect to see industries request, but never to see an impartial and fair-minded government approve.

Until recently members of the general public didn't have the technical means to exercise their fair-use rights over television content. But now that we do have the means, the TV industry wants to deprive us of it. But they have no legal argument, only financial interest. Fair use is not a luxury or a privilege; it is a right under federal copyright law. The FCC's job is to speak for the public, not to side with any industry against the public.

Federal copyright law also creates and protects the public domain. But the broadcast flag would make television content permanently proprietary, and prevent it from passing into the public domain. The TV industry is worried about piracy, but its remedy is piracy from the public domain --with government assistance.

I'd like to rest the argument here, on the right of fair-use, the right of the public domain, and the obligation of the FCC to defend the public interest.

But please consider the secondary arguments. When you look at the unexpected creativity that engineers and entrepreneurs have brought to bear on web content, music content, telephone content, and even pager content, then it doesn't take much imagination to see that the same creativity can do wonders with TV content, if left unshackled. Broadcast flag will shackle it. Before long, non-US technologies will take the lead in making creative use of television signals, and Americans will have to live without these innovations. This is another case of the dinosaurs killing the mammals --for no other reason than to enrich themselves. Again, where is the public interest in this controversy?

Finally, it boggles the mind to think of the cost of making all television and video recording equipment in the US suddenly obsolete. Does the FCC want to ask Americans to buy new equipment when the only gain is for one industry? Does the FCC want to diminish our freedom and ask us to pay through the nose for it too?

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of tjhillgardner@juno.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:54 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/25/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Thomas J. Hillgardner, Esq.

<CONTACT-EMAIL> tjhillgardner@juno.com

<ADDRESS1> 82-63 170th Street

<CITY> Jamaica

<STATE> NY

<ZIP> 11432

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> "Just Say No" to broadcast flags. This proposal is overreaching. I care less whether Disney will ever feel safe to release Fantasia on a DVD than whether I will continue to be able to use digital media equipment I purchase as it is intended and as I please. You must realize that digital technology is for everyone - not just large media conglomerates who desire to protect their copyrights from infringement. I am against infringement of copyrighted materials. But you don't bring an elephant gun to swat a mosquito.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of david-speakeasy@mindspring.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:54 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/25/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> David Olson  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> david-speakeasy@mindspring.com  
<ADDRESS1> 43 48th Street  
<CITY> Weehawken  
<STATE> NJ  
<ZIP> 07087  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> To the FCC-

I am writing in regards to your upcoming decision about the 'broadcast flag' proposal currently under consideration.

Once again I would urge you to consider the rights and concerns of US citizens and consumers to take a higher priority than those of the few Hollywood studios that this proposal would benefit.

This is NOT only about piracy--which as a digital content creator I take very seriously. This is about giving consumers choices and flexibility, as well as keeping digital creation and distribution relatively open to allow greater diversity of content. What could be more American than that?

I fully agree that piracy needs to be addressed, but this 'broadcast flag' proposal is actually a thinly veiled attempt by a few large companies to stifle potential competition and control consumer behaviour. Please put the rights of the many before the rights of the few and do not adopt this proposal.

Thank you.

david olson, ceo  
speakeasy productions  
creative content, meaningful messages

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of matt@mattcaron.net  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:54 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/25/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Matthew Caron

<CONTACT-EMAIL> matt@mattcaron.net

<ADDRESS1> 10 Rolens Dr. Apt D2

<CITY> Kingston

<STATE> RI

<ZIP> 02881

<PHONE> (401)683-8168

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> I am concerned about the proposed broadcast flag legislation because it can potentially remove some rights that consumers have had since the beginning of home recording, namely the ability to record broadcast content for later viewing (time-shifting), in the same quality as it was originally broadcast. I feel that this will both limit the general public's freedom to use broadcast content, and will basically kill an entire industry in the cradle - high quality personal video recorders (PVR's). Only now is this fledgeling industry stabilizing itself and moving from enterprising startups to established mass manufacture. If the broadcast flag restricts them (either actually or effectively) to only recording non-digital broadcasts (either because all digital broadcasts are flagged "do not record" or only the broadcasts that people don't care about (old syndicated shows, for example) are unflagged), then the market for these PVR's will decline to nothing, essentially putting TV viewing back to where it was in the 50's - you have to be a slave to your television, physically present at the time the program is on in order to watch it. You lose all the gains that have been made with PVR's that allow you to choose what program to record at what time, whether to repeat, etc. then build up a huge number of shows that you can sit down and watch whenever you like.

Thank you.



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of ksweet-fcc@motleyfool.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 3:54 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/25/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Kerri Sweet

<CONTACT-EMAIL> ksweet-fcc@motleyfool.com

<ADDRESS1> 722 s. washington st

<CITY> alexandria

<STATE> va

<ZIP> 22314

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> Will the broadcast flag interfere with consumers ability to make copies of DTV content for their personal use, either on personal video recorders or removable media? The broadcast flag when combined with the DMCA becomes a form of encryption or protection as the DMCA defines it. This will effectively prevent americans from utilizing their fair use rights in broadcasts they receive. It is also contrary to years of FCC regulations and American case law that both hold that any over the air broadcast may be used by anyone that recieves it for their own entertainment in any way they please. Would the digital flag interfere with consumers ability to send DTV content across networks, such as home digital networks connecting digital set top boxes, digital recorders, digital servers and digital display devices? If the "broadcast flag" is enacted by the FCC all digital electronic equipment will be forced to honor it. This will effectively put an end to americans making use of private recordings as they see fit in their own homes. It will also cause the loss of countless other creative works that might have been derivitive works. Would the broadcast flag requirement limit consumers ability to use their existing electronic equipment (equipment not built to look for the flag) or make it difficult to use older components with new equipment that is compliant with the broadcast flag standard? While there is no hard proof that the broadcast flag would be a problem for older digital equipment there is also no guarantee that makers of equipment that honored the broadcast flag would allow any interoperability. Would a broadcast flag requirement limit the development of future equipment providing consumers with new options? Absoutly the broadcast flag would limit what equipment the american public could own. It would create 2 classes of computer owners in the United States, the TV/Movie industry, who could own fully functional computers, and everyone else that would be forced to own crippled computers. What will be the cost impact, if any, that a broadcast flag requirement would have on consumer electronics equipment? The cost of the broadcast flag is so high that it can not be calculated. The loss to our society by forcing only crippled digital equipment (computers etc) on the United States public is so large that it can not be assigned a number. How many creative works will never happen, how many great scientific and engineering discoveries will never happen simply because the FCC is looking at "cost of parts" and not the true cost to society. Other Comments: The FCC has no business getting into Digital Restriction Management. The mandate of the FCC is to provide proper management of the airwaves as a public trust. To that end the FCC needs to act on behalf of the majority of the American public, and not on behalf of industry groups.